

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/750,656	12/31/2003	Dae Woo Lee	11036-063-999	1632	
24341	7590 09/22/20	05	EXAMINER		
	, LEWIS & BOCKI	BOLES, DEREK			
	TO SQUARE				
3000 EL CAMINO REAL			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
PALO ALT	PALO ALTO, CA 94306			3749	
			DATE MAIL ED. 00/22/2005		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/750,656	LEE, DAE WOO				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Derek S. Boles	3749				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	TE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 6(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim ill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONET	. ely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ This 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for alloward	•					
Disposition of Claims						
 4) Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) 8-10 is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) 2 and 3 is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. 						
Application Papers						
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) ☑ The drawing(s) filed on 31 December 2003 is/an Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	re: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ object drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See on is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priori application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati ity documents have been receive ı (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage				
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) ☐ Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da					
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-946) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6/21/04. 5. Patent and Trademark Office 		atent Application (PTO-152)				

Application/Control Number: 10/750,656

Art Unit: 3749

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim(s) 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Inoue et al. (6,037,567) in view of Ichikawa et al. (5,266,930). Inoue et al. discloses all of the limitations of the claim(s) except for a lever angle sensor. Ichikawa et al. discloses the presence of a lever angle sensor. See col. 11, lines 30-36 Hence, one skilled in the art would find it obvious to modify the system of Inoue et al. to include the lever angle sensor of Ichikawa et al. for the purpose of more precise heater control. See 27 of Inoue et al. for the engine control part.

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Inoue et al. It is well-known in the art of HVAC to design a switch for removing an electric current which remains at the solenoid coil after cutting off the signal generated from the relay. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the features of a switch for removing an electric current which remains at the solenoid coil after cutting off the signal generated from the relay into the system of Inoue et al. for the purpose of circuit protection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Application/Control Number: 10/750,656 Page 3

Art Unit: 3749

the invention.

claims.

Claims 4-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as

Claim 4 recites the limitation "the first and second magnetic conduit controllers" in line

2. Claim 5 recites the limitation "the first and second magnetic conduit controller spring" in line

2. Claim 6 recites the limitation "the first and second conduit guide pin springs" and "the first

and second guide pins" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in the

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 2 and 3 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 8-10 are allowed.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The provided references are representative of the state of the art that is applicable to the applicant's invention. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Derek S. Boles at (571) 272-4872.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (of) free).

D.S.B.

DERES S. BOLES
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 3700

9/19/05